UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/070,359	03/05/2002	Hidemasa Tokieda	K-2033	7112

32628 7590 08/11/2005

HAUPTMAN KANESAKA BERNER PATENT AGENTS
SUITE 300, 1700 DIAGONAL RD
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2848

EXAMINER	
KERN, MATTHEW C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/070,359	TOKIEDA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kern Matthew	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/13/02.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 6-8 objected to because of the following informalities: The term "page record" and "text record" in claims 6-8 are relative terms which render the claims indefinite. The term "page record" and "text record" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

As per claims 6 and 8, instead of "text record", --text source language record-- should be used. The examiner interprets to read "text source language record".

As per claims 6 and 7, instead of "page record", --page source language record-- should be used. The examiner interprets it to read "page source language record".

Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the specification fails to define the terms. "database management database", "contents language database", and "database access

management process". The examiner interprets "database management database" to mean the database that stores the page/text records, "contents language database" to mean the database where the dictionary and grammar rules required to complete a translation are stored, and "database access management process" to mean the interchange of information between the two aforementioned databases.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1,2,5-6,13-15,17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chong et al. (US patent 5,497,319, pub date 1996), and further in view of Murata et al. (US patent 5,987,402, pub date 1999).

As per claims 1 and 19, Chong et al. teach performing multilingual translation through a communication network (Japanese and German, where the initial language is understood to mean English, col 8, lines 64-67, and public and private networks, col 20, lines 40-41), performing and providing a translation in many languages requested

(Japanese and German, where the initial language is understood to mean English, col 8, lines 64-67), said method comprising:

- a step of receiving language data of a subject of translation (input text may be introduced by means of a disk file, downloading an electronic file, col 4, lines 39-42);
- a step of performing translation (translation transaction, col 9, lines 30);
- a step of automatically changing the processing form of translation adaptively to a language after translation (once the text has been translated into target language text, the Output Module composes the translated text into a desired page format based on formatting information in the cover page, col 19, lines 53-56).
- a step of enabling a requester side to receive the translated data (for sending output electronic text to a recipient's electronic address, col 4, lines 56-58).
- a step of changing its processing form adaptively to the language of a subject of translation requested (English text is typically more spatially expansive than ideographic text, so that 8.5"x11" input page of English text may be reformatted on the same size page with Chinese characters of suitably larger point size and interline spacings, col 19, lines 62-67).

Chong et al. does not teach a step of entering the translated data into a multilingual processing database. However, Murata et al. teach this (storage facility for storing the resulting translated documents, col 3, lines 3-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the translator of Chong et al. have a database that stores already-translated data, as taught

by Murata et al, so that if the user wants to view a translation of the same data, it does not have to be re-translated, thus decreasing processing time.

Further, Chong et al. does not teach a step of automatically selecting language data for translation. However, Murata et al. teach this (will keep the translation up to date by automatically having the document retranslated each time an updated version of the source document is retrieved, col 26, lines 51-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al. automatically update a document file as taught by Murata et al. so that the user gets the most up-to-date translated document, as taught by Murata et al (col 11, lines 63-65).

Finally, the information-storage medium limitation of claim 19 is rejected since it provides the functionality for the aforementioned methods.

As per claim 2, Chong et al. teach performing multilingual translation through a single Web site (receiving interface linked to the telecommunications link, col 6, line 60-61, where the interface is an interactive mode program acting in the same capacity as a website, and the network is analogous to the internet) consisting of one apparatus and one translation processing system (all of figure 1, element 20, considered one system).

As per claim 5, Chong et al. teach wherein said step of performing translation is an automatic machine translation (automatic utilities may be employed to determine the sublanguage dictionary most applicable to the user, col 9, lines 22-23).

As per claim 6, Chong et al. teach giving a text record (all of figure 2) and as contents information for processing each page in said multilingual processing database. Chong et al. does not teach a page record. Murata et al. teach giving a page record (version number and date and time of the most recent update, col 6, lines 36-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al's translator keep a page record for a given document so that the user is provided with the most up-to-date translated version, as taught by Murata (col 11, lines 60-64).

As per claim 13, Chong et al. teach:

- exchanging data with a database management database and a contents language database through said database access management process (user ID → automatic utilities may be employed to determine the sublanguage dictionary most applicable to the user, col 9, lines 22-24).
- obtaining the respective results of these requests through said database access management process (user ID → automatic utilities may be employed to determine the sublanguage dictionary most applicable to the user, col 9, lines 22-24, implies communication between the database management database and contents language database).

Neither Chong et al. nor Murata et al. teach performing requests including reference, addition, update and deletion with respect to a multilingual processing database and the outside. However, an artisan would recognize the need of a user to

manually reference, add, update, and remove translated documents in a translation system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al., Murata et al. enable a user to manually, reference, add, update and delete translated documents because this makes the system output more flexible for use—the user could override the system when deemed necessary and make whatever changes she desires.

As per claim 14, Chong et al. teach:

- a plurality of translator apparatuses for performing translation in many languages (core language dictionaries, plural sublanguage dictionaries, and individual user dictionaries, col 3, lines 29-32), and

-said multilingual translation Web site apparatus receives language data of a subject of translation from a translation requester apparatus (on-line user-system interaction, col 4, line 40, implies a computer from which the user sends the source text to be translated)

-translator apparatus (machine translation module, figure 1,, element 20) performs translation of language data received from said multilingual translation Web site apparatus (on-line user-system interaction, col 4, lines 42, with telecommunication interface, col 4, lines 56-58, interpreted as a web browser),

Chong et al. teach multilingual translation Web site apparatus receives translated data from said translator apparatus (machine translation apparatus→ output module, figure 1, elements 20 and 30). Chong et al. do not teach a plurality of translation

requester apparatuses for requesting the multilingual translation web site apparatus side of translation. However, Murata et al. teach this (many such client devices will be connected to the system, col 4, lines 43-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al's translator be accessible from many client devices in a networked environment so that many users could have access to the translation system.

The limitations below were already discussed in the rejection of claims 1 and 2 above:

- multilingual translation communication system for performing and providing translation in many languages requested through a communications network;
- said multilingual translation communication system comprising a multilingual translation communication system comprising a multilingual translation web site apparatus for functioning as a Web site composed of one apparatus and one translation processing system connected to a communication network and performing a multilingual translation;
- changes language data processing form adaptively to the language of the subject of translation which the multilingual translation web site apparatus has received;
- automatically selects language data for translation;
- enters them into a multilingual translation processing database; and,
- automatically changes its translation processing form adaptively to the language after translation, and said translation requester apparatus receives the translated data.

As per claim 15, Chong et al. teach a multilingual translation communication system, wherein said multilingual translation Web site apparatus is provided with a Web server (computer server, figure 1, element 10), wherein this Web server is provided with a master Web site portion for processing master contents composed of language data (input text, figure 4, element 10). Chong et al. do not teach a multilingual processing database. Murata et al, however, teach this (storage facility for storing the resulting translated documents, col 3, lines 3-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al. master web site server be linked to a database so that documents already translated would not have to be re-translated.

As per claim 17, Chong et al. teach a multilingual translation communication system, wherein said communication network is:

- or a non-public wire communication network (private telecommunications network, col 20, lines 40-41).

4. Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chong et al and Murata et al. as applied to claims 6 and 14 above, respectively, and further in view of Shimazu et al (JP 10-269285, pub date 1998).

As per claim 7, Chong et al. teach wherein said page record comprises a customer name (sender's name, figure 2, element 52). Neither Chong et al. nor Murata

et al. teach a customer ID (a symbol number assigned to each customer). Shimazu et al, however, does (User ID, para [0028]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al and Murata et al's translator require a User ID so that a translated document could be retrieved based on customer ID number, as taught by Shimazu et al (para 0036)

Further, neither Chong et al. nor Murata et al. teach a received order ID. However, Shimazu et al teach this (JobID, para [0053]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al. and Murata et al. indicate a received order ID so that orders could be translated by priority according to the date upon which it was received.

Further, neither Chong et al., Murata et al, nor Shimazu et al. teach a page ID (page identification): a symbol number being unique to each page. However, an artisan would like to include this information for each page so that each page could be retrieved using a database. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al., Murata et al., and Shimazu et al. include in the header a page ID so that a specific page could be retrieved from the database quickly.

Further, Chong et al. teach a language indicator for a hard-copy version of a document (figure 2, target lang #1, #2). Neither Chong et al., Murata et al., nor Shimazu et al. teach this for a web page in ID number format. However, an artisan would want to have this indicated in a robust form so that unnecessary translations are not performed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

of invention to have Chong et al., Murata et al, and Shimazu et al. have the user include a language ID so that unnecessary translations are not performed and translations of a certain type can be retrieved quickly.

Further, neither Chong et al. , Murata et al, nor Shimazu et al. teach the URL of the page address that is to be translated. However, an artisan would want to indicate what page is be translated. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al., Murata et al., and Shimazu et al. allow the user to indicate the URL of the web page to be translated so that the translation of the wrong web page is prevented.

Further, Murata et al teach indicating the date at which a page was generated or the date it was updated last (date and time of creation of the source document and /or translated document, col 8, lines 29-31). Neither Chong et al., Murata et al, nor Shimazu et al. teach either indicating the date at which the web page was generated or the date it was updated last. However, an artisan would recognize the need to have the most up-to-date web page translated. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al., Murata et al., and Shimazu et al. allow the user to indicate the date of generation of a web page and the time it was last updated so that web pages only the most recently updated webpages are translated.

Further, neither Chong et al., Murata et al., nor Shimazu et al. teach a generator ID. However, an artisan would recognize the need to keep track of this information so that if there is a question about a translation, the person who performed it could be

notified. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al. Murata et al, and Shimazu et al. indicate who generated a page so that if an error arises, that person can be questioned.

Further, neither Chong et al., Murata et al, nor Shimazu et al. teach an updater ID. However, an artisan would recognize the need to identify who last updated a web page so that if problems occurred, that person could be notified. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al., Murata et al. and Shimazu et al. indicate an Updater ID so that the person who did the updating could be identified and questioned.

Finally, neither Chong et al., Murata et al, nor Shimazu et al. teach a page HTML source text. However, an artisan would recognize the need for translating web pages that exist in foreign languages. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al., Murata et al, and Shimazu et al. store and translate HTML pages because an English speaker would like to, for eample, read Chinese news in HTML format.

As per claim 16, n either Chong et al. nor Murata et al. teach a multilingual translation communication system, wherein a net-bank apparatus, which makes it possible to perform settlement of a transmission fee between the multilingual translation Web site apparatus side for performing translation and a translation requester apparatus side, is further connected to the communication network. Shimazu et al, however, teach this (decision means to determine the charge of document conversion

to this language, para [0018]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al and Murata et al's translator have the means described by Shimazu et al. to keep track of how much to charge a user for a document translation job so that the owner of the translator apparatus could provide a useful service to users in exchange for a monetary price.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chong et al. and Murata et al. as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Ito et al (JP 07-192000, pub date 1995).

Chong et al. teach wherein said text record comprises:

- a character string (output text, col 19, line 48).

Chong et al teach further an indication of what language is used (source and target language, figure 2). Neither Chong et al. nor Murata et al. use a text ID (text identification) (a symbol number which is unique to each text and is the same in any language). However, an artisan would recognize the need to label each individual text, no matter what the language, with a specific number so that the database could be search for that particular document. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al and Murata et al. have the ability to label each document no matter what the language with the same number so that a specific source document could be easily retrieved from the database of Chong et al. and Murata et al.

Further, Chong et al teach an indication of what type of language is used (source and target language, figure 2). Neither Chong et al. nor Murata et al. use a language ID (a symbol number defined for each language). However, an artisan would recognize the usefulness of including some type of language identification scheme. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al and Murata et al indicate, through a number, the language in which the source text is available so that, combined with a specific document title ID, the text "The Stranger", for example, could be retrieved in English specifically and would not have to be re-loaded in the Chong et al. and Murata et al. apparatus.

Further, Chong et al teach the sender's name (sender's name, figure 2). Neither Chong et al. nor Murata et al. use a translator ID (a symbol number determined for each translator). However, an artisan would recognize the usefulness of a way of designating who requested the translation of the source document. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al and Murata et al. have some way to indicate who performed a translation of a particular source document so that a person who had a question about a particular change in the source document could locate original translator and talk to her.

Further, neither Chong et al. nor Murata et al. teach the number of characters (the number of characters actually displayed). However, Ito et al. teach this (length of the sentence before translation, purpose). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al., Murata et al.

include the number of characters actually displayed, as taught by Ito et al, so that the user can make the proper adjustments in their web page/ page layout so that at the text can fit.

Finally, neither Chong et al., nor Murata et al., nor Ito et al. teach indicating the maximum number of characters (the maximum number of characters capable of being displayed). However, an artisan would need this information so as to make sure that their text layout program could accommodate the sentences after translation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have Chong et al., Murata et al, and Ito et al. display the maximum number of characters able to be displayed so that the user knows whether the resulting translation can be accommodated by their text layout program.

6. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chong et al and Murata et al. as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Roderique et al (US patent 5,841,764, pub date 1998).

Chong et al. teach a multilingual translation communication system with a translator apparatus. Neither Chong et al. nor Murata et al. teach wherein the translator apparatus is provided with a radio communication means for performing a radio-channel connection to a radio communication network under a TCP/IP environment. Roderique et al. however, teach this (send a packet of data over an RF data communications network but at the same time permit those RF data communications to be compatible

with industry accepted inter-network protocol standards like IP and TCP/IP, col 3, lines 22-27). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the translator of Chong et al and Murata et al. have its translator apparatus provided with a radio communication means for performing radio-channel connection to a radio communication network under TCP/IP environment so that users could communicate with a translator program when the network was down using the radio-channel connection, and vice-versa. This makes the systems more robust.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3, 9-12, and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As per claim 3, none of the prior art teach where automatically selecting language data for translation generates language data and image data being non-language data in master contents by means of a template.

As per claim 9, none of the prior art teach determining in advance the ratio of the number of the smallest legible font characters to the number of characters being displayed on the screen for each language and associating the maximum number of

characters of a text data record with a symbol number defined for each language by means of this ratio.

As per claim 10, none of the prior art teach obtaining the number of characters in a language after translation on the basis of a table storing in advance the ratio of change in number of characters in a language before translation and in a language after translation.

As per claim 11, none of the prior art teach setting a storage area adaptively to said maximum number of characters, and in case that the maximum number of characters after translation can be accommodated in the storage area, performing the translation.

As per claim 12, none of the prior art teach:

- converts the language data into HTML data and writes them into the master contents on request;

As per claim 20, none of the prior art teach an information recording medium, said medium further storing in it a program for enabling a substantial computer to control at least one of;

- a process of generating language data and image data being non-language data by means of a template,

- a process of converting language data contained in image data from a text form into a binary form and replacing the text-form data with the binary-form data.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

Sugiura et al (JP 62-163177) teach a translator that changes the processing form in response to the structure of an input sentence.

Chong et al (US patent 5,535,120) teach a translator where a user feeds in a file to be translated, and the translator uses multiple dictionaries to complete the translation.

Chisholm (EP 0413556) teach converting ASCII format into binary format.

Hataoka et al (JP 09-065424) teach automatic translation using radio portable terminal equipment.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mr. Matthew Kern, whose telephone number is (571) 272-7606 or fax number (571) 273-7606. The examiner can normally be reached Mondays-Fridays from 9:30 am to 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Talivaldis Smits, can be reached at (571) 272-7628. The facsimile phone number for this Technology Center is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 receptionist, whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

8/1/05

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

MCK